



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,507	10/15/2003	Nan Marie Jockerst	62004-1211	9028
24504	7590	03/08/2006	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			PHAN, HANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2638	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/687,507	Applicant(s) JOCKERST ET AL.	
	Examiner Hanh Phan	Art Unit 2638	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 12/20/2005.
2. The indicated allowability of claims 5, 10 and 18 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Schairer (US Patent No. 6,301,035), Jayaraman et al (US Patent No. 5,914,976), Jokerst et al (US Patent No. 5,280,184), Vendier et al "Thin-Film Inverted MSM Photodetectors", IEEE Photonics Technology Letters, Vol. 8, No. 2, February, 1996 cited by applicant, and Jokerst et al "Thin-film Multichannel Optoelectronic Integrated Circuits", IEEE Transactions on Components Packaging & Manufacturing Technology-Part B, Vol.19, No. 1, February 1996, pages 97-106 cited by applicant. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krause (US Patent No. 5,448,077) in view of Jokerst et al (US Patent No. 5,280,184).

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 14, referring to Figure 8, Krause discloses a bi-directional optical link, comprising:

a detector (154, Fig. 8) having an upper surface facing a predetermined direction to receive incident light; and

an emitter (156, Fig. 8) stacked over the upper surface and oriented to direct a beam of light toward the predetermined direction (col. 3, lines 8-24).

Krause differs from claims 1, 6 and 14 in that he fails to teach a thin film detector and a thin film emitter. However, Jokerst in US Patent No. 5,280,184 teaches a thin film detector and a thin film emitter (col. 4, lines 56-65, col. 5, lines 39-43, col. 7, lines 31-46, and col. 8, lines 17-22 and 46-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector and thin film emitter as taught by Jokerst in the system of Krause. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Jokerst suggests in 4, lines 56-65, col. 5, lines 39-43, col. 7, lines 31-46, and col. 8, lines 17-22 and 46-48 that using such the thin film detector and thin film emitter have advantage of allowing decreasing optical loss and increasing collection, reducing weight, size and cost of the whole of system.

Regarding claims 2, 7 and 15, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a vertical cavity surface emitting laser (col. 8 of Jokerst, lines 17-22).

Regarding claims 3, 8 and 16, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a light emitting diode (col. 4 of Jokerst, lines 37-41).

Regarding claims 4, 9 and 17, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter further comprises a pair of electrical connectors for electrically coupling the thin film emitter to a circuit (Fig. 1 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the thin film detector and the thin film emitter comprise a substrate-removed semiconductor material (Fig. 8 of Krause and Fig. 1 of Jokerst, col. 4, lines 37-38).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the step of stacking comprises stacking to occlude a portion of the thin film detector (col. 4, lines 37-38 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the step of orienting comprises orienting the thin film emitter to emit the beam of light while the detector receives the incident light (Fig. 1 of Jokerst).

5. Claims 5, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krause (US Patent No. 5,448,077) in view of Jokerst et al (US Patent No. 5,280,184) and further in view of Vendier et al "Thin-Film Inverted MSM Photodetectors", IEEE Photonics Technology Letters, Vol. 8, No. 2, February, 1996 cited by applicant).

Regarding claims 5, 10 and 18, Krause as modified by Jokerst teaches all the aspects of the claimed invention except fails to teach the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector. However, Vendier teaches the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector (on page 1, see

Art Unit: 2638

abstract section and see the thin-film Inverted MSM photodetectors section) . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector as taught by Vendier in the system of Krause modified by Jokerst. One of ordinary would have been motivated to do this since Vendier suggests in page 1, abstract section using such the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector has advantage of allowing providing a high speed and high sensitivity photodetector.

6. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krause (US Patent No. 5,448,077) in view of Jokerst et al "Thin-film Multichannel Optoelectronic Integrated Circuits", IEEE Transactions on Components Packaging & Manufacturing Technology-Part B, Vol.19, No. 1, February 1996, pages 97-106 cited by applicant.

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 14, referring to Figure 8, Krause discloses a bi-directional optical link, comprising:

a detector (154, Fig. 8) having an upper surface facing a predetermined direction to receive incident light; and

an emitter (156, Fig. 8) stacked over the upper surface and oriented to direct a beam of light toward the predetermined direction (col. 3, lines 8-24).

Krause differs from claims 1, 6 and 14 in that he fails to teach a thin film detector and a thin film emitter. However, Jokerst teaches a thin film detector and a thin film

Art Unit: 2638

emitter (pages 97 and 99, see abstract section and see Figures 4b, 8 and 11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector and thin film emitter as taught by Jokerst in the system of Krause. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Jokerst suggests in page 1, abstract section that using such the thin film detector and thin film emitter have advantage of allowing decreasing optical loss and increasing collection, reducing weight, size and cost of the whole of system.

Regarding claims 2, 7 and 15, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a vertical cavity surface emitting laser (see page 99 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 3, 8 and 16, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a light emitting diode (see page 99 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 4, 9 and 17, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter further comprises a pair of electrical connectors for electrically coupling the thin film emitter to a circuit (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 5, 10 and 18, the combination of Krause and Jokerst the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector (Fig. 4b of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the thin film detector and the thin film emitter comprise a substrate-removed semiconductor material (Fig. 8 of Krause and Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the step of stacking comprises stacking to occlude a portion of the thin film detector (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Krause and Jokerst teaches the step of orienting comprises orienting the thin film emitter to emit the beam of light while the detector receives the incident light (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

7. Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schairer (US Patent No. 6,301,035) in view of Jokerst et al (US Patent No. 5,280,184).

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 14, referring to Figure 1, Schairer discloses a bi-directional optical link, comprising:

a detector (8, Fig. 1) having an upper surface facing a predetermined direction to receive incident light; and

an emitter (10, Fig. 8) stacked over the upper surface and oriented to direct a beam of light toward the predetermined direction (col. 2, lines 28-60).

Schairer differs from claims 1, 6 and 14 in that he fails to teach a thin film detector and a thin film emitter. However, Jokerst in US Patent No. 5,280,184 teaches a thin film detector and a thin film emitter (col. 4, lines 56-65, col. 5, lines 39-43, col. 7, lines 31-46, and col. 8, lines 17-22 and 46-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector and thin film emitter as taught by Jokerst in the system of Schairer. One of

Art Unit: 2638

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Jokerst suggests in 4, lines 56-65, col. 5, lines 39-43, col. 7, lines 31-46, and col. 8, lines 17-22 and 46-48 that using such the thin film detector and thin film emitter have advantage of allowing decreasing optical loss and increasing collection, reducing weight, size and cost of the whole of system.

Regarding claims 2, 7 and 15, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a vertical cavity surface emitting laser (col. 8 of Jokerst, lines 17-22).

Regarding claims 3, 8 and 16, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a light emitting diode (col. 4 of Jokerst, lines 37-41).

Regarding claims 4, 9 and 17, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter further comprises a pair of electrical connectors for electrically coupling the thin film emitter to a circuit (Fig. 1 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the thin film detector and the thin film emitter comprise a substrate-removed semiconductor material (Fig. 1 of Schairer and Fig. 1 of Jokerst, col. 4, lines 37-38).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the step of stacking comprises stacking to occlude a portion of the thin film detector (col. 4, lines 37-38 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the step of orienting comprises orienting the thin film emitter to emit the beam of light while the detector receives the incident light (Fig. 1 of Jokerst).

Art Unit: 2638

8. Claims 5, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schairer (US Patent No. 6,301,035) in view of Jokerst et al (US Patent No. 5,280,184) and further in view of Vendier et al "Thin-Film Inverted MSM Photodetectors", IEEE Photonics Technology Letters, Vol. 8, No. 2, February, 1996 cited by applicant).

Regarding claims 5, 10 and 18, Schairer as modified by Jokerst teaches all the aspects of the claimed invention except fails to teach the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector. However, Vendier teaches the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector (on page 1, see abstract section and see the thin-film Inverted MSM photodetectors section) . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector as taught by Vendier in the system of Schairer modified by Jokerst. One of ordinary would have been motivated to do this since Vendier suggests in page 1, abstract section using such the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector has advantage of allowing providing a high speed and high sensitivity photodetector.

9. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schairer (US Patent No. 6,301,035) in view of Jokerst et al "Thin-film Multichannel Optoelectronic Integrated Circuits", IEEE Transactions on Components Packaging &

Art Unit: 2638

Manufacturing Technology-Part B, Vol.19, No. 1, February 1996, pages 97-106 cited by applicant.

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 14, referring to Figure 1, Schairer discloses a bi-directional optical link, comprising:

a detector (8, Fig. 1) having an upper surface facing a predetermined direction to receive incident light; and

an emitter (10, Fig. 1) stacked over the upper surface and oriented to direct a beam of light toward the predetermined direction (col. 2, lines 28-60).

Schairer differs from claims 1, 6 and 14 in that he fails to teach a thin film detector and a thin film emitter. However, Jokerst teaches a thin film detector and a thin film emitter (pages 97 and 99, see abstract section and see Figures 4b, 8 and 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector and thin film emitter as taught by Jokerst in the system of Schairer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Jokerst suggests in page 1, abstract section that using such the thin film detector and thin film emitter have advantage of allowing decreasing optical loss and increasing collection, reducing weight, size and cost of the whole of system.

Regarding claims 2, 7 and 15, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a vertical cavity surface emitting laser (see page 99 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 3, 8 and 16, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a light emitting diode (see page 99 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 4, 9 and 17, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter further comprises a pair of electrical connectors for electrically coupling the thin film emitter to a circuit (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 5, 10 and 18, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector (Fig. 4b of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the thin film detector and the thin film emitter comprise a substrate-removed semiconductor material (Fig. 1 of Schairer and Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the step of stacking comprises stacking to occlude a portion of the thin film detector (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Schairer and Jokerst teaches the step of orienting comprises orienting the thin film emitter to emit the beam of light while the detector receives the incident light (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

10. Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jayaraman et al (US Patent No. 5,914,976) in view of Jokerst et al (US Patent No. 5,280,184).

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 14, referring to Figures 1 and 2, Jayaraman discloses a bi-directional optical link, comprising:

a detector (i.e., photodetector 16, Figs. 1 and 2) having an upper surface facing a predetermined direction to receive incident light; and

an emitter (i.e., VCSEL emitter 14, Figs. 1 and 2) stacked over the upper surface and oriented to direct a beam of light toward the predetermined direction (col. 3, lines 24-67, col. 4, lines 1-67 and col. 5, lines 1-67).

Jayaraman differs from claims 1, 6 and 14 in that he fails to teach a thin film detector and a thin film emitter. However, Jokerst in US Patent No. 5,280,184 teaches a thin film detector and a thin film emitter (col. 4, lines 56-65, col. 5, lines 39-43, col. 7, lines 31-46, and col. 8, lines 17-22 and 46-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector and thin film emitter as taught by Jokerst in the system of Jayaraman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Jokerst suggests in 4, lines 56-65, col. 5, lines 39-43, col. 7, lines 31-46, and col. 8, lines 17-22 and 46-48 that using such the thin film detector and thin film emitter have advantage of allowing decreasing optical loss and increasing collection, reducing weight, size and cost of the whole of system.

Regarding claims 2, 7 and 15, the combination of Jayaraman and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a vertical cavity surface emitting laser (i.e., VCSEL 14, Fig. 1 of Jayaraman and col. 8 of Jokerst, lines 17-22).

Regarding claims 3, 8 and 16, the combination of Jayaraman and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a light emitting diode (col. 4 of Jokerst, lines 37-41).

Regarding claims 4, 9 and 17, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter further comprises a pair of electrical connectors for electrically coupling the thin film emitter to a circuit (Fig. 1 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the thin film detector and the thin film emitter comprise a substrate-removed semiconductor material (Fig. 1 of Jayaramen and Fig. 1 of Jokerst, col. 4, lines 37-38).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the step of stacking comprises stacking to occlude a portion of the thin film detector (col. 4, lines 37-38 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the step of orienting comprises orienting the thin film emitter to emit the beam of light while the detector receives the incident light (Fig. 1 of Jokerst).

11. Claims 5, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jayaramen et al (US Patent No. 5,914,976) in view of Jokerst et al (US Patent No. 5,280,184) and further in view of Vendier et al "Thin-Film Inverted MSM Photodetectors", IEEE Photonics Technology Letters, Vol. 8, No. 2, February, 1996 cited by applicant).

Regarding claims 5, 10 and 18, Jayaramen as modified by Jokerst teaches all the aspects of the claimed invention except fails to teach the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector. However, Vendier teaches the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector (on page 1, see

Art Unit: 2638

abstract section and see the thin-film Inverted MSM photodetectors section) . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector as taught by Vendier in the system of Jayaramen modified by Jokerst. One of ordinary would have been motivated to do this since Vendier suggests in page 1, abstract section using such the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector has advantage of allowing providing a high speed and high sensitivity photodetector.

12. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jayaramen et al (US Patent No. 5,914,976) in view of Jokerst et al "Thin-film Multichannel Optoelectronic Integrated Circuits", IEEE Transactions on Components Packaging & Manufacturing Technology-Part B, Vol.19, No. 1, February 1996, pages 97-106 cited by applicant.

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 14, referring to Figures 1 and 2, Jayaramen discloses a bi-directional optical link, comprising:

a detector (i.e., photodetector 16, Fig. 1) having an upper surface facing a predetermined direction to receive incident light; and

an emitter (i.e., VCSEL emitter 14, Fig. 1) stacked over the upper surface and oriented to direct a beam of light toward the predetermined direction (col. 3, lines 24-67, col. 4, lines 1-67 and col. 5, lines 1-67).

Jayaramen differs from claims 1, 6 and 14 in that he fails to teach a thin film detector and a thin film emitter. However, Jokerst teaches a thin film detector and a thin film emitter (pages 97 and 99, see abstract section and see Figures 4b, 8 and 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the thin film detector and thin film emitter as taught by Jokerst in the system of Jayaramen. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Jokerst suggests in page 1, abstract section that using such the thin film detector and thin film emitter have advantage of allowing decreasing optical loss and increasing collection, reducing weight, size and cost of the whole of system.

Regarding claims 2, 7 and 15, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a vertical cavity surface emitting laser (see Fig. 1 of Jayaramen and page 99 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 3, 8 and 16, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter is a light emitting diode (see page 99 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 4, 9 and 17, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the thin film emitter further comprises a pair of electrical connectors for electrically coupling the thin film emitter to a circuit (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claims 5, 10 and 18, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst the thin film detector is an inverted metal-semiconductor-metal photodetector (Fig. 4b of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the thin film detector and the thin film emitter comprise a substrate-removed semiconductor material (Fig. 1 of Jayaramen and Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the step of stacking comprises stacking to occlude a portion of the thin film detector (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Jayaramen and Jokerst teaches the step of orienting comprises orienting the thin film emitter to emit the beam of light while the detector receives the incident light (Figs. 4b, 8 and 11 of Jokerst).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Phan whose telephone number is (571)272-3035.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan, can be reached on (571)272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Art Unit: 2638

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-4700.


HANH PHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER